

Grayson	Marshall	Rothman (NJ)
Green, Al	Massa	Royal-Ballard
Griffith	Matheson	Royce
Guthrie	Matsui	Ruppersberger
Hall (TX)	McCarthy (CA)	Rush
Halvorson	McCaul	Ryan (OH)
Harper	McClintock	Salazar
Hastings (WA)	McCollum	Sánchez, Linda
Heinrich	McCotter	T.
Heller	McDermott	Sanchez, Loretta
Hensarling	McGovern	Sarbanes
Herger	McHenry	Scalise
Hereth Sandlin	McHugh	Schauer
Higgins	McIntyre	Schiff
Hill	McKeon	Schmidt
Himes	McMahon	Schock
Hinojosa	McMorris	Schrader
Hirono	Rodgers	Schwartz
Hodes	McNerney	Scott (GA)
Hoekstra	Meek (FL)	Scott (VA)
Holt	Meeks (NY)	Serrano
Honda	Mica	Sessions
Hoyer	Michaud	Sestak
Hunter	Miller (FL)	Shadegg
Inglis	Miller (MI)	Shea-Porter
Inslee	Miller (NC)	Sherman
Israel	Miller, George	Shimkus
Issa	Minnick	Shuster
Jackson (IL)	Mitchell	Simpson
Jenkins	Mollohan	Sires
Johnson (GA)	Moore (KS)	Skelton
Johnson (IL)	Moore (WI)	Smith (NE)
Johnson, E. B.	Moran (KS)	Smith (NJ)
Johnson, Sam	Murphy (CT)	Smith (TX)
Jones	Murphy, Tim	Smith (WA)
Jordan (OH)	Murtha	Snyder
Kaptur	Myrick	Space
Kennedy	Nadler (NY)	Speier
Kildee	Napolitano	Spratt
Kilpatrick (MI)	Neal (MA)	Stearns
Kilroy	Neugebauer	Stupak
King (IA)	Nunes	Sutton
Kingston	Nye	Tanner
Kirk	Oberstar	Tauscher
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Olson	Taylor
Kissell	Olver	Teague
Klein (FL)	Ortiz	Thompson (CA)
Kline (MN)	Pallone	Thompson (MS)
Kosmas	Pastor (AZ)	Thompson (PA)
Kratovil	Paul	Thornberry
Kucinich	Paulsen	Tiahrt
Lamborn	Payne	Tiberi
Lance	Pence	Tierney
Langevin	Perlmutter	Titus
Larson (CT)	Peters	Tonko
Latham	Peterson	Towns
LaTourette	Petri	Tsongas
Latta	Pingree (ME)	Upton
Lee (CA)	Pitts	Van Hollen
Lee (NY)	Platts	Velázquez
Levin	Poe (TX)	Visclosky
Lewis (CA)	Polis (CO)	Walden
Lewis (GA)	Pomeroy	Walz
Lipinski	Posey	Wamp
LoBiondo	Price (GA)	Wasserman
Loeback	Radanovich	Schultz
Lowey	Rangel	Waters
Lucas	Rehberg	Watson
Luetkemeyer	Reichert	Watt
Lujan	Reyes	Waxman
Lummis	Richardson	Weiner
Lungren, Daniel	Rodriguez	Welch
E.	Roe (TN)	Westmoreland
Lynch	Rogers (AL)	Wexler
Mack	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (OH)
Maffei	Rogers (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Maloney	Rohrabacher	Wittman
Manzullo	Rooney	Wolf
Marchant	Ros-Lehtinen	Woolsey
Markey (CO)	Roskam	Young (AK)
Markey (MA)	Ross	Young (FL)

NOES—15

Altmire	Doyle	Rahall
Berry	Kagen	Ryan (WI)
Boccheri	Kanjorski	Sensenbrenner
Carney	King (NY)	Souder
Dahlkemper	Murphy, Patrick	Terry

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Baird	Donnelly (IN)
Cassidy	Hare

NOT VOTING—50

Ackerman	Brown-Waite,	Cao
Alexander	Ginny	Coffman (CO)
Barrett (SC)	Burgess	Conyers
Boehner	Buyer	Davis (AL)
	Calvert	Davis (CA)

DeGette	Holden	Perriello
Dicks	Jackson-Lee	Price (NC)
Edwards (TX)	(TX)	Putnam
Ehlers	Kind	Schakowsky
Gallegly	Larsen (WA)	Shuler
Gohmert	Linder	Slaughter
Green, Gene	Lofgren, Zoe	Stark
Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Sullivan
Gutierrez	Melancon	Turner
Hall (NY)	Miller, Gary	Whitfield
Harman	Moran (VA)	Wu
Hastings (FL)	Obey	Yarmuth
Hinchey	Pascrell	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain on this vote.

□ 1851

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. CANTOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, for the purpose of announcing next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the Republican whip for yielding.

On Monday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning hour and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business.

On Friday, no votes are expected.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of suspensions will be announced by the close of business tomorrow, as is usual.

In addition, we will consider H.R. 1262, the Water Quality Investment Act of 2009. We also possibly will consider H.R. 157, the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2009.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman regarding the schedule going forward if he could tell the House what the timing would be on bringing the so-called card-check bill to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. With respect to the card-check bill, as the gentleman knows, we have already passed that bill with a very handy vote. We believe that that is an appropriate bill to be passed and are supportive of it. However, we have passed that bill. The Senate has indicated that they are going to consider that bill, and my expectation is that they will be doing so in the relatively near future and we will see what action they take.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that we have in this House passed in prior Congresses that bill. As

the gentleman knows, there are plenty of new Members here that have not had a chance to vote on that bill. So if I hear the gentleman correctly, we will await Senate action prior to any House action.

Mr. HOYER. I want to make it clear, if the gentleman will yield, that it is our intention to move this bill, but we are expecting the Senate to move and we will see what they have done and we will take that up in good time.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask the gentleman for the anticipated timing on the public lands bill and when the gentleman thinks that he will bring that to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. As you know, there is a lot of interest on both sides of the aisle on this bill and very significant interest in the Senate to see this bill completed and sent to the President. We will continue to work together with the Republican leadership and the Senate leadership to get this bill to the President's desk as soon as possible. I have discussed this, as you know, with you and the leader, so we are hoping to bring this forward soon, possibly next week.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would also point out to the gentleman from Maryland, there has been a lot of discussion lately, certainly on the part of the White House, the President, about his plans for making sure of the security of our troops in Iraq and his announcement of the withdrawal timeline. I know that the Speaker has also spoken out on this issue, seeming to have somewhat of a different position than the White House on this. I know the gentleman himself, I believe, has said that he is in agreement with the President. We support the President, Mr. Speaker, in his decision to listen to the commanders on the ground.

I would note that in Congresses past we certainly have had a number of resolutions based on a timeline for withdrawal of our troops, and would ask the gentleman, is he anticipating any type of resolution of disapproval of the President's announcement?

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will yield, as you have stated, the President announced a plan last Friday at a meeting in the White House and then announced it publicly down at Camp Lejeune. It calls for withdrawal of our troops, to be out of Iraq in terms of a military role within 18 months. This is, I think personally, a responsible plan.

The gentleman asked me whether or not I think there will be a resolution of disapproval. I don't think there will be a resolution of disapproval. Clearly, as the gentleman well knows, there will be an authorizing bill that will come forward later this spring, there will be an appropriations bill appropriating money for the Defense Department, and obviously those two opportunities will present themselves to Members who may want to express themselves on this issue.

But as to the gentleman's question, do I expect a resolution of disapproval, I do not.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman on that.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman just in the context of the budget discussion that is ongoing obviously here on Capitol Hill in Congress and at the White House, there are some unanswered questions as far as the Republican Conference is concerned as to the direction of this budget that the leader sees coming through the House.

Obviously there have been some discussions about charitable giving that the gentleman himself has raised concerns regarding and that I have extraordinary concerns about taking away incentives to help support our charities in such a tough economic period, and was wondering if the gentleman could comment on whether he felt that the House budget that he will bring to the floor would reflect our concern that perhaps we shouldn't be throttling back on people's giving to charities.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman for his question and I understand his concern. As he says, I have expressed a concern with respect to that issue. However, having said that, I am not going to anticipate at this point in time what the Budget Committee is going to do. Clearly the Budget Committee is having hearings and the Budget Committee will be, some weeks from now, marking up a budget and bringing it to the floor.

As you know, we are very committed on this side of the aisle to PAYGO, paying our bills and trying to reduce our deficit. Clearly we have added very substantially to the deficit because of the economic crisis that confronts us, but we still feel a great responsibility to move ahead on making sure that we move towards reducing that deficit in the long term.

Clearly the President has proposed from our perspective one of the most honest budgets that we have received in the sense that it includes costs of the war, it includes costs for adjusting the alternative minimum tax, it includes the costs within its budget contemplation of fixing the doctors payments for Medicare. So in all those ways and more, this budget sets forth a responsible alternative for us to pursue. In addition, as the gentleman knows, it provides for the continuation of a tax cut for 95 percent of American families and individuals. So we think those are all very important proposals. We know that the Budget Committee will be considering that.

As the gentleman knows, both your side of the aisle and my side of the aisle will be discussing and debating that and we will be adopting a budget. I do not want to at this point in time anticipate each and every item that they may or may not include in that budget, however.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for that answer and just would like to

underscore our concern that as he knows and we have discussed as late as today at the President's summit on health care at the White House, these are extraordinary times. We have tough choices to make.

□ 1900

Families are out there struggling to make ends meet. And the President has continued to say that we will provide tax relief for working Americans. We will provide tax relief to 95 percent of the American people.

The trouble, Mr. Speaker, that we're having is when we hear members of the President's administration talk about the President's desire to see cap-and-trade legislation pass through this House, and the admission on the part of officials in the administration that that legislation would produce \$1,300 worth of additional tax to every household in this country, if we do the math, with the Make Work Pay Program, and even if one was able to get the maximum relief under that program, that's an \$800 relief for a household. You do the math, we still are at a point where you have a \$500 deficit in each household, if every one of those were to be able to receive the maximum relief.

So I would ask the gentleman, as far as the overall sense of the budget that he will bring to the floor, are we really going to deliver on this tax relief? Or are we going to try and address this cap-and-trade program, which has now been admitted to be an extra tax that will outweigh any tax relief under the Make Work Pay Program?

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his question.

Let me first observe that, quite obviously, we are going to provide for tax relief, as the President said in his campaign, as he's reiterated in his speech to the joint session, tax relief for 95 percent of taxpayers. We have every intention of pursuing that.

We also have every intention of having a fiscally responsible budget. We also, as the President also indicated in his speech to the joint session, will pursue vigorously energy independence and the issue of global warming.

The gentleman speaks of one of the alternatives, an alternative proposed by the President to deal with that issue in terms of cap-and-trade. The Energy and Commerce Committee will be considering that, as the gentleman knows, and I'm not going to anticipate their specific action. But I am going to say that we are committed on this side of the aisle, as I hope your side of the aisle will be as well, to very, very substantially reducing the carbon footprint that we are making in this country, and indeed, that's being made around the world, which we believe that science is pretty clear on this. And very frankly, the previous administration, which did not express that view early in its tenure, during its last year, changed somewhat its view. In any event, we want to deal with that.

And the gentleman has mentioned an alternative the President has proposed. It's an alternative supported by a large number of people, and that is before the committee. And we'll see what the committee does with it.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman again, and would say that, again, our priority must be on, as he has said in the past as well, must be on this economy. It must be on maintaining, protecting and creating jobs. And we believe, as the gentleman knows, on this side of the aisle, that the way to do that is to focus on small businesses, to ensure that we're not adding burdens to the real job generators, which are our small businesses.

So if we're talking about bringing this budget forward and talking about PAYGO, as the gentleman has referred to, I know last year we passed the stimulus bill, and the gentleman indicated that we waived PAYGO back then for tax relief. I know that Members on our side of the aisle would certainly be supportive of any bit of relief we could give to those small businesses.

But, Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the gentleman again, in the context of where we're operating now, and the fact that the Dow Jones dropped another 280 points today, and the fact we've not gotten from the White House and the administration a plan for the bank fix. We don't know the direction that the TARP funding is going. We have a sense from some of the statements made in the Budget Committee and others this last several days, that the TARP money has been all committed. And if so, is there any indication, do we know how much more money will be impacting this budget?

Because, Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the gentleman how he expects this House to produce an honest budget if we do not know the plans of this administration, which will occur, I'm sure, imminently in their request for more assistance and more money towards the banking problem.

And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his question. Of course, at the center of that question is the crisis that we confront in the economy. As the gentleman knows, he talked about, in a bipartisan way, supporting the President's policy on Iraq. As the gentleman knows, in a bipartisan way, we supported the Bush administration's request, both in January of 2008, in September of 2008, and again in December of 2008, when the President made a request for the second tranche of the TARP. I think every Member of this Congress believes that the first tranche did not work as well as we had hoped it would work.

We also, in these past 2 weeks, have passed extraordinarily quickly and robustly, consistent with the advice of the last administration and this administration, an attempt to do what the gentleman says we want to do, create jobs.

The gentleman also knows that we passed a recovery and reinvestment bill that had over \$250 billion of tax relief, some for individuals and some for small businesses, some for businesses generally. About 35 percent of that bill was tax relief for our citizens. The other percentage of that bill was for investment, was for dealing with those who have been put at deepest risk by the economic crisis, in terms of losing jobs, in terms of not being able to feed their families and not having health care available to them.

So I say to my friend that, as we move forward on the budget, and as we look to the administration for the clarification that the gentleman seeks, appropriately, in my opinion, and in our opinion, a more specific outline of how the administration's going to proceed, we will have that in consideration when we produce a budget. And as I say, we intend to produce a responsible budget that looks towards deficit reduction. That obviously won't be until some time from now. We've got to turn this economy around, start creating jobs which, hopefully, will have the effect of the stock market going up, not down, which is to the interest of all of us.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I yield back my time.

VOTING RIGHTS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TONKO. Two and a third centuries ago, before our United States Capitol had even been imagined, the Founders were asking a question we hear in the District of Columbia to this day, and that is, how can we cut out a city from its home State and put it under the direct rule of Congress without violating the principles that the Revolutionary War fought to secure?

James Madison argued that there was only one way around that hypocrisy, "to provide for the rights and the consent of the citizens inhabiting it." And further, its people "will have had their voice in the election of the government which is to exercise authority over them."

That was the intent of our Founders. Those were the conditions for this District to exist, but they have not been upheld. 233 years later, of all the world's democracies, there is only one national capital without full voting rights. Washington, D.C., this city full of monuments to democracy, holds that distinction. At last, that's on the verge of changing.

Soon this House will vote on a bill to give the District of Columbia a voting Member of the House of Representatives. I urge my colleagues in this Chamber to finally give the people of Washington, D.C. a vote in this great body.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KRATOVL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

STAFF-LED TOURS OF THE CAPITOL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep concern about the difficulties Member offices are experiencing offering staff-led tours of the Capitol.

As Chair of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee, I am fully committed to making sure Member offices can continue providing this important service to their constituents.

The Capitol is not a museum. It is a living, breathing institution at the core of our representative democracy. Staff-led tours give our constituents a chance to experience the work that goes on here on a personalized level.

When there was talk last year about eliminating staff-led tours, we made clear at our oversight hearings that preserving those tours should be one of the highest priorities for the Capitol Visitor Center. Reflecting that priority, we included a provision in last year's Legislative Branch Appropriations bill prohibiting the elimination of staff-led tours.

However, preserving the existence of the tours and putting a button on the CVC Web site is simply not enough. We also need to make sure that the system in place doesn't diminish Member offices' ability to offer staff-led tours. Mr. BRADY and I intend to work aggressively over the next few weeks to ensure that improvements to the system arrive before the peak visitor season hits.

Staff who give tours should receive training, but we need to make sure that the time requirements make sense, that the training is consistent and effective, and that classes are offered frequently enough to meet Member office needs. We also need to make sure that we don't homogenize the Capitol tour and turn this beautiful institution into a museum.

Staff-led tours offer something that guide-led tours cannot, a personalized experience that incorporates items of State and local interest. We need to make sure that we don't take that personal touch out of the tour process.

We also need to make sure that Member offices are given clear information about how to accommodate their constituents if the on-line reservation system shows all the slots for a given day are taken.

The CVC Web site and reservation system also could stand improvement, particularly standardizing the on-line process for booking staff-led tours so that you don't have to hunt and peck to figure out how to book one.

I look forward to working with Mr. BRADY and the authorizing committees on these issues so we can make the existing system more user-friendly, without compromising security or overloading the Capitol building.

And I encourage and ask all Members if they have suggestions to please offer them to us.

□ 1915

DEFENDERS OF THE ALAMO THAT DIED MARCH 6, 1836 BY MARY ANN NOONON GUERRA—HISTORIAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 163 years ago this night, on March the 5th, 1836, would be the last night for a group of individuals who came from all over the United States. They were from most of the States. They were from numerous foreign countries. They were odd sorts of individuals. They were frontiersmen, landowners, lawyers, unemployed. They were of all races—black, white and brown—but they were all volunteers, and most of them knew that this would be their last night after spending 12 days defending an old, beat-up Spanish fort that had already been over 100 years old. It was now a mission but also a fortress, what we call the Alamo.

You see, this odd bunch of individuals ended up there because all of them had ended up and had come to Texas from different parts of the country—from Mexico, from Europe—to seek a new life.

Backing up in history a little bit, the country of Spain had claimed most of Central America and Mexico, which included Texas at the time. Mexico decided to revolt against Spain. That revolution was successful, and in 1824, the country of Mexico adopted a constitution drafted very similarly to ours, which gave civil liberties to all people in Mexico, which included Texas.

But Mexico had a problem with a dictator. His name was Santa Anna, and when he became dictator of Mexico, he abolished the Constitution of 1824. He eliminated civil rights. He abolished the right to be tried by a jury, and he imposed dictator powers on Mexico. That offended people who lived in what is now Texas. It offended people of all races. So, in 1835, a revolution started in Texas.